

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8
9 TRICIA RAYLENE LESLIE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 GENERAL MOTORS LLC,

13 Defendant.

14 Case No. 1:24-cv-00915-JLT-SAB

15 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
RECOMMENDING GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A
CLAIM

16 (ECF No. 7)

17 OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN FOURTEEN
18 DAYS

19
20
21 Currently before the Court is General Motors LLC's ("Defendant") motion to dismiss
Tricia Raylene Leslie's ("Plaintiff") fourth cause of action for violation of California Business
and Professions Code, section 17200, in the first amended complaint for failure to state a claim.
Having considered the moving papers, the declarations and exhibits attached thereto, as well as
the Court's file, the Court issues the following findings and recommendations.

22 **I.**

23 **BACKGROUND**

24
25 On or about September 26, 2023, Plaintiff purchased a new 2024 Chevrolet Silverado
("the subject vehicle") from an authorized dealer. (First Amended Compl. ("FAC") ¶¶ 7-9, ECF
26 No. 1-3.) Each time the subject vehicle exhibited defects, a defective battery, Plaintiff attempted
27 to invoke the applicable warranties within a reasonable time of discovering the defect. (*Id.* at ¶¶
28 13, 54-56.) On each occasion, Defendant represented they could and would make the subject

1 vehicle conform with the warranties or that they had repaired the vehicle. (*Id.* at ¶ 14.) Plaintiff
2 discovered that Defendants were unable, or unwilling, to make the subject vehicle conform to the
3 applicable warranties. (*Id.* at ¶ 15.)

4 Plaintiff filed this action on July 8, 2024, in the Superior Court of California, County of
5 Tulare. (ECF No. 1-1.) Defendant was served with the complaint on July 10, 2024. (ECF No.
6 1-2 at 2.¹) On July 11, 2024, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint.² (ECF No. 1-3.) On
7 August 7, 2024, Defendant removed this matter to the Eastern District of California. (ECF No.
8 1.)

9 Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's first amended complaint on August 13,
10 2024. (ECF No. 7.) On August 14, 2024, the motion was referred to the undersigned for the
11 preparation of findings and recommendations and a hearing on the motion was set for October 2,
12 2024. (ECF Nos. 7, 9.) Plaintiff did not file an opposition to the motion to dismiss.

13 **II.**

14 **LEGAL STANDARDS**

15 **A. Rule 12(b)(6)**

16 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a party may file a motion to dismiss on
17 the grounds that a complaint "fail[s] to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." A
18 motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) tests the legal sufficiency of the complaint. Navarro
19 v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001). In deciding a motion to dismiss, "[a]ll allegations
20 of material fact are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving
21 party." Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 80 F.3d 336, 337–38 (9th Cir. 1996). The pleading
22 standard under Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does not require " 'detailed factual
23 allegations,' but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully harmed-me
24 accusation." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v.
25 Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). In assessing the sufficiency of a complaint, all well-

26 ¹ All references to pagination of specific documents pertain to those as indicated on the upper right corners via the
27 CM/ECF electronic court docketing system.

28 ² The first amended complaint does not indicate when it was filed, however it is dated July 11, 2024, and Defendant
states it was filed on this date.

1 pleaded factual allegations must be accepted as true. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678-79. However,
2 “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory
3 statements, do not suffice.” Id. at 678. To avoid a dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6), a complaint
4 must plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Twombly, 550
5 U.S. at 570.

6 In deciding whether a complaint states a claim, the Ninth Circuit has found that two
7 principles apply. First, to be entitled to the presumption of truth the allegations in the complaint
8 “may not simply recite the elements of a cause of action, but must contain sufficient allegations
9 of underlying facts to give fair notice and to enable the opposing party to defend itself
10 effectively.” Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1216 (9th Cir. 2011). Second, so that it is not unfair
11 to require the defendant to be subjected to the expenses associated with discovery and continued
12 litigation, the factual allegations of the complaint, which are taken as true, must plausibly
13 suggest an entitlement to relief. Starr, 652 F.3d at 1216. “Dismissal is proper only where there
14 is no cognizable legal theory or an absence of sufficient facts alleged to support a cognizable
15 legal theory.” Navarro, 250 F.3d at 732 (citing Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dept., 901 F.2d 696,
16 699 (9th Cir.1988)).

17 **B. Rule 9**

18 Allegations of fraud are subject to the pleading requirement of Rule 9 of the Federal
19 Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 9 provides that “[i]n alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state
20 with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). This
21 requires a plaintiff to plead with “more specificity including an account of the time, place, and
22 specific content of the false representations as well as the identities of the parties to the
23 misrepresentations.” Swartz v. KPMG LLP, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (internal
24 punctuation and citations omitted).

25 To allege fraud with particularity, a plaintiff must set forth more than the neutral
26 facts necessary to identify the transaction. The plaintiff must set forth what is
27 false or misleading about a statement, and why it is false. In other words, the
28 plaintiff must set forth an explanation as to why the statement or omission
complained of was false or misleading. A plaintiff might do less and still identify
the statement complained of; indeed, the plaintiff might do less and still set forth
some of the circumstances of the fraud. But the plaintiff cannot do anything less

1 and still comply with Rule 9(b)'s mandate to set forth with particularity those
2 circumstances which constitute the fraud.

3 In re GlenFed, Inc. Sec. Litig., 42 F.3d 1541, 1548 (9th Cir. 1994).

4 **C. Leave to Amend**

5 Courts freely grant leave to amend a complaint which has been dismissed. See Fed. R.
6 Civ. P. 15(a)(2) ("The court should freely give leave when justice so requires."); Schreiber
7 Distrib. Co. v. Serv-Well Furniture Co., 806 F.2d 1393, 1401 (9th Cir. 1986) ("If a complaint is
8 dismissed for failure to state a claim, leave to amend should be granted unless the court
9 determines that the allegation of other facts consistent with the challenged pleading could not
10 possibly cure the deficiency."); Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) (same).

11 **III.**

12 **DISCUSSION**

13 Defendant moves to dismiss the fourth cause of action arguing that the FAC relies on
14 generalized allegations to support the claim under California Business and Professions Code,
15 section 17200 ("the UCL"). Defendant asserts that the allegations in the FAC are sparse and do
16 not meet the federal pleading standard to sustain the claim. (Def.'s Mot. to Dismiss ("Mot.") 6,
17 ECF No. 7.) Defendant argues that the FAC generally alleges "defects, nonconformities,
18 misadjustments, or malfunctions" in the subject vehicle, which include a defective battery, but
19 does not identify the supposed defects, any details regarding attempts at repair, or even the name
20 of the dealership involved, but simply claims that marketing and sale of the vehicle was false,
21 deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable and constitutes unfair and fraudulent conduct. (Id. at 6-
22 7.) Defendants assert that Plaintiff alleges that Defendant knew or should have known of its
23 fraudulent conduct but does not identify any specific advertisement or date when any
24 advertisement was viewed by Plaintiff. Defendant claims that the FAC does not contain any
25 specific allegations regarding Defendant's presale knowledge or how or when it was obtained.
26 Defendant argues that the FAC mostly relies on templated, conclusory allegations identical to the
27 fraud claim that Plaintiff's counsel has filed in dozens of other Song-Beverly matters against
28 Defendant. (Id. at 7.)

1 Defendant argues that the FAC alleges that Defendant knew or should have known that
2 representations about the subject vehicle were false and concealed defects in the vehicle, but
3 does not identify any representation or concealed fact, the date when any representation was
4 reviewed by Plaintiff and does not state that Defendant knew of the alleged defects before
5 Plaintiff's purchase. (*Id.* at 7-8.)

6 When a complaint or a claim within a complaint is grounded in fraud, it must meet the
7 pleading requirements of Rule 9. Velazquez v. Gen. Motors LLC, No. 2:24-CV-01519-DAD-
8 CSK, 2024 WL 3617486, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2024) (quoting Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp.
9 USA, 317 F.3d 1097, 1107 (9th Cir. 2003)). Rule 9(b) requires that “the circumstances
10 constituting the alleged fraud be specific enough to give defendants notice of the particular
11 misconduct so that they can defend against the charge and not just deny that they have done
12 anything wrong.” Kearns v. Ford Motor Co., 567 F.3d 1120, 1124 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Bly-
13 Magee v. California, 236 F.3d 1014, 1019 (9th Cir. 2001) (internal punctuation omitted). To
14 satisfy the particularity standard of Rule 9(b), “a pleading must identify the who, what, when,
15 where, and how of the misconduct charged, as well as what is false or misleading about the
16 purportedly fraudulent statement, and why it is false.” Moore v. Mars Petcare US, Inc., 966 F.3d
17 1007, 1019 (9th Cir. 2020) (quotations omitted) (quoting Davidson v. Kimberley-Clark Corp.,
18 889 F.3d 956, 964 (9th Cir. 2018)). Therefore, a party alleging fraud must “set forth more than
19 the neutral facts necessary to identify the transaction.” Kearns, 567 F.3d at 1124 (quoting In re
20 GlenFed, Inc. Sec. Litig., 42 F.3d at 1548). However, “[m]alice, intent, knowledge, and other
21 conditions of a person’s mind may be alleged generally.” Irving Firemen’s Relief & Ret. Fund
22 v. Uber Techs., Inc., 998 F.3d 397, 404 (9th Cir. 2021).

23 Here, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s claims under the UCL are grounded in fraud.
24 Plaintiff alleges in all causes of actions under the UCL that Defendant’s marketing is false,
25 deceptive, and misleading and that the misrepresentations by defendant violate section 17200.
26 (FAC at ¶¶ 57, 58, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 74, 80.) Further, Plaintiff’s claim under the unlawful
27 prong is based on violations of California Business and Professions Code section 17500, et seq.,
28 which prohibits false and misleading statements. (*Id.* at ¶ 71.) For this reason, Plaintiff must

1 plead the UCL claims with particularity to survive a motion to dismiss.

2 **A. Whether the FAC States a Claim under the UCL**

3 The UCL prohibits “any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice and
4 unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising.” Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200. “An act can be
5 alleged to violate any or all three of the prongs of the UCL—unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent.”
6 Stearns v. Select Comfort Retail Corp., 763 F.Supp.2d 1128, 1149 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (quoting
7 Berryman v. Merit Prop. Mgmt., Inc., 152 Cal.App.4th 1544, 1554 (2007). Here, Plaintiff has
8 alleged that Defendant has engaged in all three.³

9 1. Fraudulent business practice

10 Defendant first moves to dismiss the UCL claim on the ground that the fraudulent prong
11 fails because Plaintiff has not been pled with particularity, the FAC does not contain the required
12 how, where, to whom and by what means any misrepresentation or concealment occurred. (Mot.
13 at 9-12.) Defendant also argues that Plaintiff has not alleged any facts plausibly showing that
14 Defendant “knew or should have known of their unfair” and “fraudulent” conduct nor have any
15 past marketing efforts been pled with particularity. (Id. at 12-13.)

16 The elements of a fraud claim under California law are “(a) misrepresentation (false
17 representation, concealment, or nondisclosure); (b) knowledge of falsity (or ‘scienter’); (c) intent
18 to defraud, i.e., to induce reliance; (d) justifiable reliance; and (e) resulting damage.” Kearns,
19 567 F.3d at 1126; Lazar v. Superior Court, 12 Cal. 4th 631, 638 (1996).

20 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant engaged in fraudulent conduct by marketing and
21 distributing a defective vehicle at the point of sale without notifying prospective consumers that
22 the vehicle is unsafe and therefore, the sale of the defective vehicle is false, deceptive,
23 misleading and unreasonable and constitutes fraudulent conduct. (FAC at ¶¶ 64-65.) Defendant
24 knew or should have known of the fraudulent conduct and the misrepresentations by Defendant
25 constitute a fraudulent business practice in violation of section 17200. (Id. at ¶¶ 66-67.)
26 Defendant had reasonably available alternatives to further its legitimate business interests. (Id. at
27

28 ³ The Court has considered all arguments raised in Defendant’s motion to dismiss but only addresses those necessary
to decide whether Plaintiff has stated a claim under the UCL.

1 ¶ 68.) This conduct occurs and continues to occur in Defendant's business and is part of a
2 pattern or generalized course of conduct repeated on thousands of occasions daily. (Id. at ¶ 69.)
3 Plaintiff suffered injury in fact and has lost money as a result of Defendant's fraudulent conduct
4 by paying an unwarranted premium for the vehicle. (Id. at ¶ 70.)

5 The allegations in the FAC do not even satisfy the Rule 8 pleading requirement, much
6 less the heightened pleading standard for fraud. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant knew or should
7 have known of the fraudulent conduct and the misrepresentations constitute a fraudulent business
8 practice (FAC at ¶ 66, 67), but there are no facts alleged regarding how Defendant would be
9 aware of any defect with the subject vehicle, nor any misrepresentations made to Plaintiff.
10 Rather, Plaintiff solely alleges that the vehicle had a defective battery (id. at ¶ 54). While
11 Plaintiff alleges there was an express warranty that the vehicle would be free from defects, and if
12 defects were present, they would be repaired by General Motors (id. at ¶ 10), there are no facts
13 alleged in the complaint as to the express warranty nor of any statements made to Plaintiff prior
14 to her purchasing the vehicle. The complaint is devoid of any information on who made the
15 alleged representations to Plaintiff or when they were made.

16 Further, Plaintiff alleges that each time the vehicle exhibited defects, she notified
17 General Motors through an authorized service and repair facility within a reasonable time after
18 discovery and attempted to invoke the applicable warranties demanding the vehicle be repaired
19 pursuant to the warranties. (Id. at ¶ 13.) On each occasion, Defendant represented that they
20 could and would make the vehicle conform to the warranties or that they had successfully
21 repaired the vehicle (id. at ¶ 14) but Defendant failed to make the subject vehicle conform to the
22 applicable warranties (id. at ¶ 15). However, there are no facts alleged as to when or where the
23 vehicle was taken and who made any such representations to Plaintiff. Missing from Plaintiff's
24 complaint are any facts to support the allegations. See Velazquez, 2024 WL 3617486, at *5-6
25 (dismissing fraud claim for failure to plead with particularity).

26 Finally, where a plaintiff's UCL theory is that the defendant engaged in
27 misrepresentations that deceived customers, the plaintiff must show reliance. Veera v. Banana
28 Republic, LLC, 6 Cal.App.5th 907, 919 (2016). Plaintiff's complaint is devoid of any factual

1 allegations regarding her reliance on any misrepresentation by Defendant. The Court finds that
2 Plaintiff fails to state a claim for a fraudulent business practice in violation of the section 17200.

3 2. Unfair business practices

4 Defendant contends that Plaintiff's unfair business practice claim also fails because she
5 merely makes conclusory statements that Defendant's conduct is unfair without referencing any
6 public policy that was violated or conduct that is immoral, unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous.
7 (Mot. at 17.)

8 California's UCL prohibits any unfair business act or practice. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
9 17200. There is some uncertainty regarding the definition of unfair in consumer cases under the
10 UCL. See Graham v. Bank of America, N.A., 226 Cal.App.4th 594, 613 (2014). The Ninth
11 Circuit has recognized three tests that are used by courts under the UCL's unfairness prong: "(1)
12 whether the challenged conduct is 'tethered to any underlying constitutional, statutory or
13 regulatory provision, or that it threatens an incipient violation of an antitrust law, or violates the
14 policy or spirit of an antitrust law,' [quoting Durell v. Sharp Healthcare, 183 Cal.App.4th 1350,
15 1366 (2010)]; (2) whether the practice is 'immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous or
16 substantially injurious to consumers,' [quoting Morgan v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc., 177
17 Cal.App.4th 1235, 1254 (2009)]; or (3) whether the practice's impact on the victim outweighs
18 'the reasons, justifications and motives of the alleged wrongdoer.' Id." Doe v. CVS Pharmacy,
19 Inc. ("CVS Pharmacy, Inc."), 982 F.3d 1204, 1214–15 (9th Cir. 2020).

20 Here, Plaintiffs allege the practice is unfair under the balancing test, when any injury it
21 causes outweighs any benefits it provided to consumers and the injury is one the consumer's
22 themselves could not reasonably have avoided. (FAC at ¶ 51.) Defendant engaged in an unfair
23 practice by distributing the vehicle with a defective battery which caused Plaintiff to overpay for
24 the vehicle. (FAC at ¶¶ 54-56, 62.) Defendants also allege that the misrepresentations and the
25 marketing of the vehicle is false, deceptive, misleading and unreasonable and constitutes unfair
26 conduct. (Id. at ¶¶ 57-58.) The complaint fails to state a claim due to lack of particularity as
27 discussed above.

28 Although Plaintiff alleges that in a conclusory fashion that any injury outweighs any

1 benefit provided to consumers, the FAC does not sufficiently allege how this is so. Rule 8
2 requires sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant
3 is liable for the misconduct alleged. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678-79; Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572
4 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009). The “sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully” is
5 not sufficient, and “facts that are ‘merely consistent with’ a defendant’s liability” falls short of
6 satisfying the plausibility standard. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678; Moss, 572 F.3d at 969. Here,
7 Plaintiff merely alleges conclusions without any supporting facts to state a plausible claim that
8 Defendant’s conduct entitles Plaintiff to relief. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678 (“[t]hreadbare recitals of
9 the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice”).
10 However, because the UCL claim is grounded in fraud, Plaintiff must plead such facts with
11 particularity and has not done so here. The Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim
12 under the unfair prong of the UCL.

13 3. Unlawful Business Practice

14 “For an action based upon an allegedly unlawful business practice, the UCL ‘borrows
15 violations of other laws and treats them as unlawful practices that the unfair competition law
16 makes independently actionable.’ ” Stearns, 763 F.Supp.2d at 1150 (citation omitted); see also
17 Smith v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co., 93 Cal.App.4th 700, 718-19 (2001) (“An
18 ‘unlawful’ business activity includes ‘anything that can properly be called a business practice
19 and that at the same time is forbidden by law.’ ”). Any federal, state, or local law can serve as a
20 predicate for an action under the unlawful prong of section 17200. Smith, 93 Cal.App.4th at
21 718.

22 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant’s conduct violates California Business and Professions
23 Code section 17500, et seq. (FAC at ¶ 71.) Section 17500 makes it unlawful to publicly make
24 or disseminate—with the intent to dispose of property or to induce the public to enter into any
25 obligation relating thereto—any statement which the speaker knows or reasonably should know
26 to be “untrue or misleading.” Epperson v. Gen. Motors, LLC, 706 F.Supp.3d 1031, 1040 (S.D.
27 Cal. 2023) (quoting Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500). Plaintiff again alleges that Defendant’s
28 marketing is false, deceptive, misleading and unreasonable (FAC at ¶ 72), and the

1 misrepresentations made by Defendant constitute an unlawful business practice (*id.* at ¶ 74).

2 Plaintiff's claim for unlawful practices in violation of the UCL are grounded in fraud.

3 The complaint is devoid of any allegations to describe the marketing or any false and
4 misleading statements. Plaintiff alleges Defendant knew or should have known of the unlawful
5 conduct (*id.* at ¶ 73), but there are no factual allegations to show how Defendant would have
6 been placed on notice that any statements were false or misleading. Here, Plaintiff merely sets
7 forth conclusions without any supporting facts to state a plausible claim that Defendant's
8 conduct entitles Plaintiff to relief. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for
9 an unlawful business practice in violation of the UCL. *See CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, 982 F.3d at
10 1214 (allegations that are conclusory and do not allege facts demonstrating how the defendant
11 violated the regulation are insufficient to state a claim).

12 **B. Equitable Jurisdiction**

13 Defendant asserts that Plaintiff has not alleged that there is no equitable remedy at law
14 available and has not established jurisdiction for her UCL claims. (Mot. at 17.) Defendant
15 argues that since the UCL only provides for equitable remedies, and Plaintiff has an adequate
16 remedy at law under the Song-Beverly Act, the UCL claim should be dismissed. Further,
17 Defendant argues that Plaintiff has not sufficiently pled any allegations that would warrant
18 injunctive relief, nor has she established that there is an actual or imminent threat of further
19 injury based on her purchase of the subject vehicle. (*Id.*)

20 The UCL only provides for equitable remedies. *Guzman v. Polaris Indus. Inc.*, 49 F.4th
21 1308, 1313 (9th Cir. 2022), cert. denied sub nom. *Polaris Indus. Inc. v. Albright*, 143 S. Ct. 2612
22 (2023); *Veera*, 6 Cal.App.5th at 915. The Ninth Circuit has held that "federal courts must apply
23 equitable principles derived from federal common law to claims for equitable restitution under
24 California's [UCL] and [CLRA],' including 'the principle precluding courts from awarding
25 equitable relief when an adequate legal remedy exists.' " *Guzman*, 49 F.4th at 1312 (quoting
26 *Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, 971 F.3d 834, 837, 842 (9th Cir. 2020)). "In order to
27 entertain a request for equitable relief, a district court must have equitable jurisdiction, which can
28 only exist under federal common law if the plaintiff has no adequate legal remedy." *Guzman*, 49

1 F.4th at 1313.

2 In situations similar to this, courts have found that a plaintiff may not bring a claim under
 3 the UCL as the Song-Beverly Act provides an adequate remedy at law.

4 Apart from civil penalties, which are not at issue here,[4] the UCL provides only
 5 equitable remedies. See Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 29 Cal.4th
 6 1134, 1144 (2003); Madrid v. Perot Systems Corp., 130 Cal.App.4th 440, 452
 7 (2005). A plaintiff seeking equitable relief must establish that there is no
 8 adequate remedy at law available. See Knox v. Phoenix Leasing, Inc., 29
 9 Cal.App.4th 1357, 1368 (1994). Thus, statutory relief under the UCL “is subject
 10 to fundamental equitable principles, including inadequacy of the legal remedy.”
Prudential Home Mortg. Co. v. Superior Court, 66 Cal.App.4th 1236, 1249
 11 (1998). Because the UCL provides for only equitable remedies, and plaintiffs
 12 have an adequate remedy at law for the alleged Song-Beverly Act violation,
 13 plaintiff’s UCL claim must be dismissed. See Rynes v. Striker, 2011 WL
 14 2149095 at *3 (N.D. Cal. May 31, 2011).

15 Durkee v. Ford Motor Co., No. 14-cv-0617-PJH, 2014 WL 4352184, at *2–3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2,
 16 2014); see also Velazquez, 2024 WL 3617486, at *8 (same); Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales,
 17 U.S.A., Inc., No. CV 15-8629 FMO (EX), 2016 WL 7486600, at *13 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2016)
 18 (collecting cases). However, other courts have found that there is no bar to the pursuit of
 19 alternate remedies at the pleading stage. Deras v. Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc., No. 17-CV-
 20 05452-JST, 2018 WL 2267448, at *6 (N.D. Cal. May 17, 2018).

21 The Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to allege facts to show that equitable jurisdiction
 22 exists for the ULC claim and the UCL claim should be dismissed on this ground. Plaintiff has an
 23 adequate remedy at law under the Beverly-Song Act and has brought such claims in this action.
 24 (See FAC at pp. 5-10.) Further, as Defendant argues Plaintiff has not shown that she would be
 25 entitled to injunctive relief based on her past purchase of the subject vehicle. (Mot. at 17.) To
 26 the extent that Plaintiff would seek injunctive relief, a plaintiff who has no intention of
 27 purchasing a product in the future has no standing to seek prospective injunctive relief. Bird v.
First Alert, Inc., No. C 14-3585 PJH, 2014 WL 7248734, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2014). Since
 28 Plaintiff has an adequate remedy at law, equitable jurisdiction does not exist. Accordingly, the
 29 Court recommends granting Defendant’s motion to dismiss without leave to amend. See Durkee,

30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349

1 2014 WL 4352184, at *3, 9 (dismissing UCL claim with prejudice for lack of equitable
2 jurisdiction); Bird, 2014 WL 7248734, at *5-6, 7 (dismissing UCL claims with prejudice);
3 Velazquez, 2024 WL 3617486, at *8-9 (dismissing UCL claim without leave to amend).

4 **IV.**

5 **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Defendant's motion to
7 dismiss Plaintiff's first amended complaint for failure to state a claim be GRANTED and the
8 UCL claim be DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND.

9 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the district judge assigned to this
10 action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and this Court's Local Rule 304. Within **fourteen**
11 (**14**) **days** of service of this recommendation, any party may file written objections to these
12 findings and recommendations with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document
13 should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The
14 district judge will review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations pursuant to 28
15 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified
16 time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th
17 Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: September 12, 2024



20

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28